

## REMARKS

Claims 1-14 and 27-38 are pending.

Claims 1-14 and 27-38 were rejected.

Claims 1, 7, 27, 34 and 36 are amended. No new matter is added.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant amends claim 36 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 27-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brandin et al. (U.S. Patent 6,493,813) variously in view of Biran (US Patent 6,345,347), Bryg et al. (U.S. Patent 6,430,670), Ji (US PG Publication 2005/0086363) and Rajski et al. (US PG Publication 2002/0016806).

In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner states at page 4 line 14 that “a number” is broadly construed as “any number” rather than a “total number” of bits, and therefore that Brandin teaches a hash value hash including a number of bits (196) equal to a number of bits (196) of the original key minus a number of bits (0) of the partial key. Applicant notes that this claim construction would render the hash value the same as the original key, which would be contrary to general rules of claim construction that two claim elements are to be construed as separate or different elements. Brandin does not disclose a partial key comprised of zero bits. Furthermore, Brandin does not teach subtracting a partial key comprising zero bits, nor why one would be motivated to do so.

Applicant amends Claim 1 to recite “wherein the hash value includes a number of bits equal to a total number of bits of the original key minus a total number of bits of the partial key.” This feature is not disclosed by any of the references. Applicant amends claims 7, 27 and 34 to

recite the same feature as provided in amended Claim 1. The amendment of Claims 1, 7, 27 and 34 are made to expedite prosecution and without prejudice with regards to pursuing the claims as previously presented or in other forms in a continuation or other application. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-14 and 27-38.

Any statements made by Examiner that are not addressed by Applicant do not necessarily constitute agreement by the Applicant. In some cases Applicant has amended or argued the allowability of independent claims thereby obviating grounds for rejection of the dependent claims

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-14 and 27-38 of the application as amended is requested. The examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 73552**

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP



Bryan D. Kirkpatrick  
Reg. No. 53,135

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP  
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 224-2170